Document electronically

generated from the

United Nations

Optical Disk System

1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

NPT/CONF.1995/MC.I/SR.10
8 May 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

MAIN COMMITTEE I

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 10th MEETING

Held at United Nations Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 4 May 1995, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria)

CONTENTS

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE TREATY AS PROVIDED FOR IN ITS ARTICLE VIII, PARAGRAPH 3:

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY RELATING TO NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY:

(ii) ARTICLES I AND II AND PREAMBULAR PARAGRAPHS 1 TO 3

(b) SECURITY ASSURANCES

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference and Support Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of this meeting and of other meetings of the Conference will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Conference.

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE

1. Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka), President of the Conference, said that he had been assured by the Chairman of Main Committees I and II that those Committees would be able to submit their reports by the established deadline. He was aware of the inherent complexity of the issues faced by Main Committee I and recognized the efforts that were being made to reach agreement, but felt that it was his duty as President of the Conference to appeal to delegations to enter the negotiations and discussions in a spirit of cooperation and compromise so as to be able to conclude the work on time. The success of the Committee's efforts was crucial to the outcome of the Conference and the future of the Treaty.

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE TREATY AS PROVIDED FOR IN ITS ARTICLE VIII, PARAGRAPH 3:

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY RELATING TO NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

(ii) ARTICLES I AND II AND PREAMBULAR PARAGRAPHS 1 TO 3 (NPT/CONF.1995/MC.1/CRP.8/Rev.6, CRP.25 and WP.5)

Document NPT/CONF.1995/MC.1/CRP.8/Rev.6

2. The CHAIRMAN said there was no problem with the additional text in paragraph 1, listing the countries which had acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons since the previous Review Conference. Paragraphs 2-6 contained no new language.

3. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had not agreed to paragraph 5, and maintained its position that language similar to that used in paragraph 6 should be added in paragraph 5. His delegation had agreed to consider paragraph 5 in the context of paragraph 9, but since that had not been done at the previous meeting, it wanted the additional words inserted in paragraph 5. Many States and non-governmental organizations had expressed concerns about the violation of article 1 of the Treaty by certain nuclear-weapon States, and those concerns should be reflected in the final document.

4. Mr. HAMDAN (Lebanon) said that his delegation had also expressed reservations about paragraph 5 and had said that paragraph 5 should be considered in conjunction with paragraph 9.

5. Mr. BESANCENOT (France) said that document NPT/CONF.1995/MC.I/CRP.8/Rev.6 reflected the state of the discussion where it had been left off. There had been agreement on paragraphs 5 and 6, and various proposals had been made in regard to paragraph 9, on which agreement had not been reached.

6. Mr. HAMDAN (Lebanon) said that the representative of France was not taking into account Lebanon's reservation to paragraph 5; other delegations had also

had doubts about paragraph 5, and he reserved the right to return to that paragraph after the consideration of paragraph 9 was completed.

7. Mr. COTAN (Indonesia) said his delegation had proposed that in paragraph 9 ter, the words "of certain aspects of" should be changed to "of the implementation of" so as to reflect the actual situation.

8. Mr. PERUGINI (Italy) felt that the Conference's task was to review the operation of the Treaty, not to interpret it; article VIII, paragraph 3, was quite clear in that respect. For that reason, the first three alternatives for paragraph 9 were not acceptable. Moreover, the paragraphs should have appeared in the order in which the proposals had been made; paragraph 9 quater should be paragraph 9 bis, and vice versa.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that the order of the paragraphs did not reflect any gradation in their importance; they appeared as submitted.

10. Mr. AKINCI (Turkey) said that none of the alternatives to paragraph 9 was acceptable. His delegation supported the compromise proposal made on the previous day by the Chairman to delete the original paragraph 9 and add a phrase at the end of paragraph 7. His delegation proposed that until the alternatives to paragraph 9 were deleted, the last phrase of paragraph 7 (in bold print) should be put in brackets.

11. Mr. HAMDAN (Lebanon) said that paragraph 9 ter had a certain degree of neutrality. States had the right to make various interpretations of the Treaty and no charge was being levelled against anyone. Some States had expressed concerns, and it was right that those concerns should be reflected in the final document. The other variants for paragraph 9 expressed the viewpoints of certain countries or groups of countries and such viewpoints could not be imposed on other States. In a spirit of consensus, paragraph 9 ter should be viewed as a way out which would help accelerate the pace of the Committee's work towards a speedy conclusion.

(b) SECURITY ASSURANCES

12. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the report of the Working Group on Security Assurances and Article VII (NPT/CONF.1995/MC.1/CRP.26) which had been informally adopted on the previous day. The document had been finalized, and he took it that the Committee wished to accept it.

13. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

NPT/CONF.1995/MC.I/SR.11
10 May 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

MAIN COMMITTEE I

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 11th MEETING

Held at United Nations Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 5 May 1995, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria)

CONTENTS

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE TREATY AS PROVIDED FOR IN ITS ARTICLE VIII, PARAGRAPH 3 (continued)

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY RELATING TO NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY (continued)

(i) ARTICLES I AND II AND PREAMBULAR PARAGRAPHS 1 TO 3 (continued)

(ii) ARTICLE VI AND PREAMBULAR PARAGRAPHS 8 TO 12 (continued)

(iii) ARTICLE VII WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THE MAIN ISSUES IN (a) and (b) (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference and Support Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of this meeting and of other meetings of the Conference will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Conference.

95-80973 (E)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE TREATY AS PROVIDED FOR IN ITS ARTICLE VIII, PARAGRAPH 3 (continued)

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY RELATING TO NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY (continued)

(i) ARTICLES I AND II AND PREAMBULAR PARAGRAPHS 1 TO 3 (continued)

(ii) ARTICLE VI AND PREAMBULAR PARAGRAPHS 8 TO 12 (continued)

(iii) ARTICLE VII WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THE MAIN ISSUES IN (a) AND (b) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft report of Main Committee I, which had been circulated to members. After its adoption by the Committee, the report would be forwarded through the plenary Conference to the Drafting Committee of the Conference.

2. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, to the dismay of his delegation, the draft report was not a true reflection of what had taken place in the drafting sessions. None of his delegation's proposals were reflected as submitted, and those which were included had been relocated and thus distorted. It would, therefore, be difficult for his delegation to give further consideration to the draft report.

3. Mr. EKWALL (Sweden) said that his delegation was also unable to accept the text in its current state and would have comments to make on it during the drafting session.

4. Mr. COTAN (Indonesia) said that some of his delegation's proposals had not been reflected either, although no objection had been raised when they had been put forward and the Secretariat had taken due note of them. Omission of some of the proposals submitted could prevent the Committee from reaching a consensus on the document.

5. Mr. ARCILLA (Philippines) said that he wished to know why paragraph 8 quater appeared in brackets in the draft report, since he had heard no dissent when that text had been proposed.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that the paragraph had been placed in brackets because no discussion had taken place on it; consequently, agreement could not have been reached on the text. It had not been physically possible to reflect every suggestion made, but substantive submissions had been reflected in so far as possible. Amendments could, of course, be made during the process of adopting the draft.

7. Mr. BESANCENOT (France) said that he did not believe there was a true divergence between the views of the Chairman and those of delegations.

Obviously it had not been possible to reflect the large number of proposals received, especially when it was unclear whether or not objections had been raised. The matter might best be addressed in the drafting session.

8. Mr. KAREM (Egypt) said that, regrettably, certain delegations had made official proposals which were not reflected in the draft, despite widespread support. While he commended the strenuous efforts of the Chairman and the Secretariat to finalize the document, it was nevertheless important for delegations to represent their national positions and implement directives from their Governments. Perhaps the time constraints could be noted in a footnote to the report or mentioned by the Chairman in his report to the Drafting Committee.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that any omissions had been inadvertent and were due to the difficulty of assembling the draft report and the complexity of the issues. Unless the Committee could find a way to move forward without reopening the discussion, however, it would be unable to submit its report to the plenary Conference as scheduled.

10. Mr. COTAN (Indonesia) proposed that the meeting should be suspended for one hour to allow the Secretariat sufficient time to incorporate all proposals in the draft.

11. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) suggested that delegations should submit their amendments in writing in order to facilitate the work of the Chairman and the Secretariat.

12. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that although his delegation's proposals had been submitted in writing, they still had not been reflected. He strongly supported the proposal made by the representative of Egypt: his delegation could agree to continue consideration of the draft report only if a footnote stating that the draft did not include all proposals submitted by delegations was inserted on page 1, or if all its paragraphs were placed within brackets.

13. Mr. EKWALL (Sweden) noted that language which had not been accepted at the drafting session had been included in the final draft of the report.

14. Mr. SCHAERLI (Switzerland) said that the current version of the draft posed problems to his delegation as well.

15. Mr. KAREM (Egypt) proposed that the meeting should be suspended in order to allow further consultation with the officers and interested delegations.

The meeting was suspended at 12.15 p.m. and resumed at 1.05 p.m.

16. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee would resume its consideration of the draft report in an informal drafting session.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.